

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. The amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new matter. Claim 8 has been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Monroe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,545,601). Claims 1-6 and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Monroe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,366,311). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended Claims 1 and 11 recite, in part, wherein said video camera comprises a color camera capable of producing an image that meets or exceeds predetermined quality standards. Both Monroe references fail to disclose or suggest the use of color video cameras. In fact, the Office Action acknowledges that the Monroe '601 reference does not disclose or suggest color video cameras. See 7/19/04 Office Action at ¶ 6. Therefore, the Monroe references fail to anticipate or render obvious amended Claim 1 and amended Claim 11. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 102 rejection of Claim 1, Claim 11, and those claims dependent therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,545,601 B1) in view of Myrick (U.S. Pat. No. 5,045,937). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 8. Specifically, both Claim 1 and Claim 11 have been amended to recite, in part, wherein the video camera comprises a color camera capable of producing an image that meets or exceeds predetermined quality standards. The Office Action acknowledges that the Monroe '601 reference fails to disclose or suggest the use of color cameras. See 7/19/04 Office Action at ¶ 6. The Office Action cites the Myrick reference as a reference that discloses color cameras and asserts that the combination of the two references renders Claim 8 obvious.

To establish a prima facie case of obvious, there must first be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine reference teachings. See MPEP § 2143. This Section 103 rejection fails because there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references.

The Monroe '601 reference is directed to a security system for aircraft and other commercial vehicles using numerous sensors and video cameras. The Monroe '601 reference fails to provide any suggestion for providing color cameras. The Myrick reference is related to a geographical surveying system, which is completely unrelated to the security system of the Monroe '601 reference. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in

the art of security systems would not look to the Myrick reference to combine its teachings with the Monroe '601 reference. The Office Action's prima facie case of obviousness fails because no motivation exists to combine the Monroe '601 reference and the Myrick reference, unless one is looking at the Applicant's own disclosure for suggestions and guidance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection of the subject matter of Claim 8, which has been incorporated into all of the pending claims through the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 11.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 6, 2004

By: Brent G. Seitz
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Brent G. Seitz, Reg. No. 54,435

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
MDE/BGS/les